HELCOM

Contributions of emissions from different countries and sectors to atmospheric nitrogen input to the Baltic Sea and its sub-basins

Baltic Marine Environment

Protection Commission

Published by:

Helsinki Commission – HELCOM Katajanokanlaituri 6 B 00160 Helsinki, Finland

www.helcom.fi

Information and views expressed in this publication are the authors' own and might vary from those of the Helsinki Commission or its members.

For bibliographic purposes this document should be cited as: "Contributions of emissions from different countries and sectors to atmospheric nitrogen input to the Baltic Sea and its sub-basins. HELCOM (2024)"

© Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission – Helsinki Commission (2024)

All rights reserved. Information included in this publication or extracts thereof, with the exception of images and graphic elements that are not HELCOM's own and identified as such, may be reproduced without prior consent on the condition that the complete reference of the publication is given as stated above.

Authors: Michael Gauss, Ágnes Nyíri and Heiko Klein. Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W) of EMEP Norwegian Meteorological Institute

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to HELCOM for financing the work presented in this report. The authors would also like to acknowledge the EMEP Centre CEIP for providing emission data, colleagues at EMEP MSC-W for providing the necessary software and meteorological data needed for these calculations, and ECMWF (European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts) for the computing facilities.

Layout: Laura Ramos Tirado

mmmn

Contents

1. Introduction

Nitrogen deposition to the nine sub-basins of the Baltic Sea, along with source-receptor relationships quantifying airborne nitrogen inputs from different countries, are calculated annually by the EMEP Centre MSC-W within the frame of our routine work for HELCOM (see Gauss et al., 2023, for the latest results on airborne nitrogen deposition in 2021).

In this report, additional calculations on sector level are presented, identifying the main contributing emission sectors to nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea in the year 2021. The input data and the computational methods are described, and an overview of results is provided in the form of tables and diagrams.

More comprehensive data tables, containing the entire source-receptor matrices, are provided separately in Excel format. The spatially gridded data sets (maps) are saved on EMEP MSC-W's longterm disk storage facilities in netCDF format and can be made available on request.

2. Model setup and calculations

All calculations in this study have been performed with the EMEP MSC-W air quality model. This chapter briefly introduces this model, the experimental setup, and the input data used in this study.

2.1 The EMEP MSC-W model

The EMEP MSC-W model is a multi-pollutant 3D Eulerian Chemical Transport Model and has been used for all nitrogen computations presented here. The model takes into account processes of emissions, advection, turbulent diffusion, chemical transformations, wet and dry depositions and inflow/outflow of pollutants into/out of the model domain. It is documented in detail in Simpson et al. (2012) and the annual chapters on model updates in the EMEP status reports (see Simpson et al., 2021; 2022; 2023, and references therein, for the latest updates).

The model is regularly evaluated against measurements from the EMEP network under the LRTAP Convention [\(https://aeroval.met.no/evaluation.php?project=emep\)](https://aeroval.met.no/evaluation.php?project=emep), but also in a large number of international research projects and operational services, for example in the Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service (CAMS), where evaluation graphs are updated every day, and detailed reports are issued on a quarterly basis [\(https://atmosphere.copernicus.eu/regional-services\)](https://atmosphere.copernicus.eu/regional-services).

As in every atmospheric composition model, deviations between model and observations do occur, highly variable both in space and time. These are subject to continuous investigation and result in further development and modifications of the model and the input data used. Nevertheless, the performance of the EMEP MSC-W model can be considered as state-of-the-art over a large range of both gaseous species and particulate matter. The transparency of EMEP model results and activities is further ensured by the availability of the EMEP model code as Open Source at the *github* repository [\(https://github.com/metno/emep-ctm\)](https://github.com/metno/emep-ctm). In this way, the scientific community as well as advanced policy users can check and apply the model themselves, both as a research tool and to underpin air quality legislation.

The EMEP MSC-W model version rv5.0 has been used for the deposition calculations presented here. This is the same version as was used for the EMEP Status report 2023 (EMEP, 2023) and in the routine work for HELCOM (Gauss et al., 2023).

2.2 Emission data

2.2.1 Source regions

As in the previous project of this kind (Gauss et al., 2020), thirteen source countries/regions have been considered:

- The nine HELCOM countries:
- the sum of all EU countries that are not parties to HELCOM;
- ship traffic in the North Sea (**NOS**);
- ship traffic in the Baltic Sea (**BAS**);
- the rest of the world.

The nine HELCOM countries are Denmark (**DK**), Estonia (**EE**), Finland (**FI**), Germany (**DE**), Latvia (**LV**), Lithuania (**LT**), Poland (**PL**), the Russian Federation (**RU**)*, and Sweden (**SE**). In the remainder of this report, HELCOM countries will be referred to by their 2-letter abbreviation but in lists be sorted alphabetically by their full name.

EU countries that are not parties to HELCOM are labelled '**EUnonHel**' in this study and include Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Slovakia, and Slovenia.

Countries and areas not listed above are combined in '**RoEMEP**' (=rest of the EMEP model domain) in this study and include Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Montenegro, North Afric[a*,](#page-5-1) North Macedonia, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan, Aral Lake, Black Sea, Caspian Sea, Mediterranean Sea, North Atlantic Ocea[n*,](#page-5-1) and Remaining Asian area[s*.](#page-5-1)

One important change since Gauss et al. (2020) is that the United Kingdom is now part of 'RoEMEP' rather than 'EUnonHel'. This must be kept in mind when judging the importance of these source groups in 2021 compared to the results we had published for 2017.

Latest emission data for the year 2021 were obtained in June 2023 from the EMEP Centre CEIP and are listed in the EMEP Status report 1/2023 (EMEP, 2023, their Table A:1). These emissions have been used in our calculations for this project for all land areas throughout the EMEP model domain (displayed in Section 2.3, Fig. 4). The emission data are publicly available at the *WebDab Emission database* at https://ceip.at (see under "Emissions as used in EMEP models" there).

2.2.2 Emission Sectors

Since 2017, emission data provided by EMEP Parties to the Convention via the EMEP Centre CEIP are categorized based on the GNFR system (**G**ridded **N**omenclature **F**or **R**eporting). The 13 main GNFR sectors and how these were combined into the sectors requested in the contract for this project are shown in Table 1. More detail on how GNFR (and the underlying NFR sector emissions) are grouped is given in the Reporting Guidelines of CEIP (CEIP, 2019), and in particular in their Annex 1.

The calculations for this study consider the following five emission sectors:

• 'AGR': Agriculture

.

- 'TRA': Transport (aviation landing/take-off, road traffic and offroad traffic, inland shipping)
- 'POW': Power (including mainly combustion, but also other processes)
- 'OSC': Other stationary combustion (i.e. stationary combustion other than power generation)
- 'OTH': All other sources (this also includes some combustion from industry)

^{*} Countries and areas marked by star are not fully included in the EMEP model domain (shown in Section 2.3, Fig. 4). Only emissions within the EMEP model domain are included in the model calculations. However, the contributions to nitrogen depositions to the Baltic Sea from countries and areas outside the EMEP model domain, although very small, are taken into account through the lateral boundary conditions in the model.

GNFR sectors	Simplified sectors used in this study
GNFR_A: Public Power	\rightarrow Power ('POW')
GNFR_C: Other Stationary Combustion	\rightarrow Other Stationary Combustion ('OSC')
GNFR F: Road Transport	\rightarrow Transport ('TRA')
GNFR_G: Shipping	
GNFR H: Aviation	
GNFR 1: Offroad	
GNFR_K: Agriculture Livestock	→ Agriculture ('AGR')
GNFR_L: Agriculture Other	
GNFR_B: Industry	\rightarrow Other ('OTH')
GNFR_D : Fugitive	
GNFR E: Solvents	
GNFR J: Waste	
GNFR_M: Other	

Table 1. GNFR sectors (left column) used for emission reporting in the EMEP programme, and how these have been combined into simplified sectors (right column).

International shipping is not included in the reports from EMEP parties but is added to the 'Transport' sector in our calculations. We use the CAMS-GLOB-SHIP data set for 2021 (Denier van der Gon et al., 2023, their chapter 4), which is based on the STEAM model version 4.3 developed at the Finnish Meteorological Institute (Jalkanen et al., 2009, 2016; Johannson et al., 2017) and processed for use in EMEP models by the EMEP emission centre CEIP. These emission data are publicly available as well (*WebDab Emission database* at https://ceip.at, see "Emissions as used in EMEP models").

Figures 1 and 2 show the percentage contributions from different sectors to emissions of oxidized and reduced nitrogen emissions, respectively, within each of the nine HELCOM countries. There are clear differences between countries, but Transport (TRA) is the single largest contribution in all countries for oxidized nitrogen, while Agriculture (AGR) is the most dominant sector in all countries for reduced nitrogen. This will be reflected in the source-receptor results presented in Chapter 3.

Figure 1. Percentage contributions from different sectors to total emissions of oxidized nitrogen (NOx) in each of the nine HELCOM countries in 2021. For sector abbreviations see Table 1.

Figure 2. Percentage contributions from different sectors to total emissions of reduced nitrogen (NH₃) in each of the nine HELCOM countries in 2021. For sector abbreviations see Table 1.

In this context it may be interesting to note that NOx emissions from the transport sector are decreasing due to the gradual electrification of road traffic (EEA, 2023), a trend that is expected to continue in the future (Z. Klimont/International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), pers. comm., 2024). At the same time, the production of energy to drive electric vehicles will cause emissions from the Power sector (to the extent this energy is not produced from renewable sources). The contribution from the transport sector will thus decrease in absolute terms, and likely also in its percentage share within the total country emissions.

2.2.3 Emission totals and spatial distribution

The emission totals for 2021 are listed in Tables 2 and 3 for oxidized and reduced nitrogen, respectively, for each of the nine HELCOM countries and the five emission sectors considered in this study. The tables also show the required percentage reductions with respect to 2005 values (according to the Gothenburg Protocol) and whether the commitments have been achieved. Poland, as a member of the EU, is subject to the NEC Directive, according to which it is to reduce its NOx emissions by 30% and its NH₃ emissions by 1% (both commitments were achieved by 2021). Only HELCOM parties are included in the Tables. Other countries that did not fulfil their Gothenburg Protocol commitment by 2021 are Romania (for NOx), as well as Bulgaria, Luxembourg, Norway and Portugal (for NH3).

In Figure 3, the distribution of nitrogen emissions is shown, clearly reflecting major population centres and, in the case of NOx emissions, also ship tracks in maritime regions. Reduced nitrogen is not emitted from sea areas. NOx emissions from international shipping are not listed in the table, but amount to 171.1 ktonnes(N)/year for the North Sea and 81.6 ktonnes(N)/year for the Baltic Sea. They are included in the Transport (TRA) sector in the source-receptor calculations presented in Chapter 3.

Table 2. Upper 6 rows: Emissions of oxidized nitrogen (NOx) in 2021 within the five sectors defined for this study, as well as the country total, from each of the nine HELCOM parties. Unit: ktonnes(N)/year. For sector abbreviations see Table 1. Lower 3 rows: 'Commitment': Percentual change in emissions with respect to 2005 values required by the Gothenburg Protocol, 'Actual': Percentual change in emissions achieved between 2005 and 2021, 'Compliance': Has the commitment been fulfilled (Yes or No)? Poland and Russia have not ratified the Gothenburg Protocol. For Poland, information is given in relation to the EU NEC Directive.

Table 3. Same as Table 2, but for NH₃.

^{*)} Note that for the Russian Federation (RU), the emission totals listed here apply to the part of the country that is included in the EMEP model domain (shown in Section 2.3, Fig. 4).

Figure 3. Maps of annual emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx, left) and ammonia (NH₃, right) in the Baltic Sea region in the year 2021, as provided by CEIP for use in the EMEP MSC-W model. Unit: tonnes(N) km⁻² yr⁻¹.

2.3 Computational methods

There are different methods to calculate source-receptor relationships (i.e. the contributions from different sources to concentrations and depositions of air pollutants in a given receptor area). For this study, as in all other studies of this type that have been done for HELCOM until now, we have used a kind of perturbation method:

First, a so-called *base run* is performed (for 2021), where all emissions are included in full. This simulation is to reproduce the real situation in 2021 as closely as possible. In the following *perturbation runs*, the emission of one pollutant from one source is reduced by 15% in the model, and the result is compared to the base run in order to assess the importance of the pollutant and the source that has been perturbed. The choice of reducing by 15% is based on many years of experience and is a compromise between staying within the linear regime of atmospheric chemistry (infinitesimal perturbations) and getting a good signal-to-noise ratio. The difference in nitrogen deposition in comparison to the base run is then scaled to 100% by multiplying it by 100/15 to get an estimate of the *total* contribution from the emission source that has been perturbed. This calculation has to be done for all the *5* main pollutants (SOx, NOx, NH3, VOC, PM), all the *13* considered sources and the 5 sectors, so in theory we would need to perform $5 \times 13 \times 5 = 325$ model simulations, in addition to the base run mentioned above. However, 42 simulations can be omitted: The regions BAS and NOS (Baltic Sea and North Sea) only emit from the Transport sector, and they do not emit reduced nitrogen.

Nevertheless, more than 280 model simulations had to be performed. For this project we could make use of the High Performance Computing system Atos, hosted by ECMWF in Bologna. Therefore, it was decided to perform the source-receptor calculations in 0.3° (lon) \times 0.2° (lat) resolution (rather than the coarser 50 \times 50 km² polar-stereographic grid, which was used in the previous project of this kind, see Gauss et al., 2020). The $0.3^\circ \times 0.2^\circ$ grid is the same as used for the SR calculations for the EMEP status report (EMEP, 2023) and the HELCOM routine work (Gauss et al., 2023). Figure 4 shows the EMEP model domain covered by this grid.

Figure 4. Geographic domain used in the EMEP model calculations. (green: EMEP contracting parties, orange: other countries areas, blue: marine areas)

The definitions of the nine sub-basins considered in this study are listed in Table 4 and visualized in Figure 5.

The meteorological data used in this study have been generated by EMEP MSC-W by running the ECMWF IFS model cycle 46r1 (see [ECMWF model documentation\)](https://www.ecmwf.int/en/elibrary/81141-ifs-documentation-cy46r1-part-iv-physical-processes).

Contributions to nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea depend on meteorological conditions, and these vary from year to year. For this project we decided to use 2021 meteorology and to scale the contributions to the *actual* total deposition calculated for 2021 in 2023 (Gauss et al., 2023). An alternative approach would have been to scale to the *normalized* deposition, i.e. the results obtained in (Gauss et al., 2023) when using 2021 emissions but *average* weather (based on a method described detail i[n Appendix D](https://emep.int/publ/helcom/2017/Chapter12_AppD_description_1.pdf) of Bartnicki et al. (2017)). However, this could mislead users of the data to believe that we have calculated normalized contributions from individual sectors, which is not the case. The normalized deposition was calculated by Gauss et al. (2023) for country contributions only, but not for sector contributions.

The sum of the contributions presented in this report (and in the accompanying Excel table) thus matches the total actual deposition in 2021 in the Baltic Sea (as calculated in the routine work in 2023), which is 100.6 ktonnes(N), 90.5 ktonnes(N), and 191.1 ktonnes(N) for oxidized, reduced and total nitrogen, respectively.

Without scaling, the sum of contributions would have been 97.9 ktonnes(N), 87.2 ktonnes(N) re-N, and 185.1 ktonnes(N) for oxidized, reduced and total nitrogen respectively. The effect of the scaling is thus well below 5%. The reason why these numbers differ at all is due to remaining non-linearities in atmospheric chemistry (the sum of contributions is not exactly equal to the total deposition) and the fact that the actual deposition calculated in the routine work in 2021 is diagnosed in a model simulation at 0.1 x 0.1 degree simulation, while the contributions in this study were calculated in a coarser (0.3 x 0.2 degree) grid.

Table 4. The nine sub-basins of the Baltic Sea used for computing depositions, with abbreviations used in this report and areas given in km².

Figure 5. Locations of the sub-basins of the Baltic Sea listed in Table 4 and used for all nitrogen deposition calculations presented in this report. The original figure with the sub-basins was provided by the Baltic Nest Institute (BNI).

2.4 A note on transfer coefficients

When considering source-receptor relationships, an interesting question is how much of each country's emission to the atmosphere is deposited to the Baltic Sea. This percentage is represented by the so-called *transfer coefficients*, which in the context of this report are the factors by which a country's total emission has to be multiplied in order to obtain the country's contribution to atmospheric nitrogen deposition to the Baltic Sea. Transfer coefficients are calculated routinely each year by EMEP MSC-W for the HELCOM countries and the Baltic Sea and are listed in Table 5. They tend to be larger for sources that are close to the Baltic Sea or located upwind of it, or both. However, there are several additional factors that determine the exact magnitude of transfer coefficients, such has meteorological conditions, the chemical lifetime of the species, and the location of emission sources with respect to receptor areas. For example, *reduced* nitrogen emitted several tens of kilometers away (and upwind) from the coast will have a smaller chance of being deposited to the sea than *oxidized* nitrogen because the latter has a longer chemical lifetime. However, if the emission source is located near the coast, the difference in lifetime may not have a noticeable effect because both reduced and oxidized nitrogen will be deposited to the sea located just downwind of the emission source. Indeed, if the adjacent sea area is narrow, e.g. the Kattegat, *reduced* nitrogen emitted from a Danish source close to the coast may even have a larger chance of being deposited to the sea than oxidized nitrogen, because the latter may have a sufficiently long lifetime to get transported to Sweden. Of course, in order to judge a country's importance for nitrogen deposition to the Baltic Sea, the information on transfer coefficients is not sufficient but has to be considered together with the country's total emission.

Table 5. Transfer coefficients for oxidized, reduced and total nitrogen from different countries. The table answers the question as to how large a percentage of each country's domestic emissions is deposited to the Baltic Sea via the atmosphere. Numbers are given for oxidised, reduced and total airborne nitrogen separately. Example: 10% of Estonia's annual emission of oxidised nitrogen (NOx) is deposited to the Baltic Sea. All calculations are *normalized* and based on emissions of 2021.

3. Results

The calculated contributions from the different countries and emission sectors to nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea and its sub-basins in 2021 are presented in the following sections - separately for oxidized, reduced and total nitrogen.

3.1 Oxidized nitrogen deposition

Table 6 lists contributions to oxidized nitrogen deposition in the entire Baltic Sea by country/region and by sector.

The single most important contribution comes from Transport in BAS, i.e. NOx emissions from international shipping in the Baltic Sea. Its contribution amounts to about 18 ktonnes(N) of oxidized nitrogen deposition in the year 2021. However, when summing up all emission sectors, emissions from BAS make the largest contribution (17.9%), followed by Germany (15.2%) and the 'RoEMEP' group of countries/regions (13%). 'EUnonHel' group of countries comes in forth place, down from the first place which it had in the previous study for 2017. This is mainly due to the fact that the Unitited Kingdom now belongs to 'RoEMEP' and not to 'EUnonHel' anymore.

The Transport sector makes by far the largest contribution to oxidized nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea (62.1%).

The percentage contributions by countries/regions listed in the second-to-last column of Table 6 and the percentage contributions by sector (last row of Table 6) are visualized as pie charts in Figure 6.

The percentage contribution made by each sector to a county's/region's total contribution is shown in Figure 7. The Transport sector (orange bars) stands for the largest share in all countries/regions. In 5 of the 9 HELCOM countries it stands for more than half of their total contribution to oxidized nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea.

Table 6. Contributions from different countries/regions and sectors to oxidized nitrogen deposition in the entire Baltic Sea. Unit: tonnes(N)/year. Source countries/regions are sorted vertically by their percentage contribution to oxidized nitrogen deposition ("contribution by country to total", from largest to smallest). For comparison, the results from the last report (for 2017) are given in grey font in the last column.

Figure 6. Contributions from different countries/regions (left pie) and from different sectors (right pie) to deposition of oxidized nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. The pie charts are based on the percentages given in bold type in Table 6.

Percentage of total contribution (ox-N)

Figure 7. Percentage contribution made by each sector to the country's/region's total contribution to oxidized nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea in 2021. For each country/region, the 5 bars sum up to 100%, corresponding to the country's/region's total contribution.

Figures 8 and 9 show the horizontal distribution of oxidized nitrogen deposition contributed by the Transport sector in different countries/regions in 2021. The Transport sector is chosen here as an example as it has the largest impact on oxidized nitrogen deposition among the five sectors considered in this study. In general, the source country/region affects itself the most (in terms of deposition per unit area), but long-range transport does occur, with somewhat longer transport distances to the east than to the west. Counterintuitively, the effect of NOx emissions from NOS and BAS peaks over land (coastal regions). This is because nitrogen is more easily deposited over land surfaces than on water.

Table 7 contains the same information as Table 6, but sorts all the contributions from sources considered in this study from largest to smallest. As mentioned above, Transport from BAS tops this list, but there are many other Transport contributions among the top 10. The top 10 contributions make up almost 64% of the total, while the top 25 contributions constitute about 90% of the total.

Finally, Table 8 lists the top 25 contributions among the considered sources for each of the 9 subbasins of the Baltic Sea. Transport emissions are strongly represented in this table, and of course the geographic location of countries/regions with respect to the sub-basin in question plays a role. For example, German emission sectors contribute less to the Bothnian Bay than to the Western Baltic (due to the larger distance), and Sweden plays a larger role for the sub-basins located east of it than west of it, due to the predominantly (on annual average) westerly wind direction.

Figure 8. Distribution of contributions to oxidized nitrogen deposition due to Transport emissions from NOS, BAS, EUnonHel and RoEMEP in 2021. Unit: kg(N)/km²/year.

Figure 9. Distribution of contributions to oxidized nitrogen deposition due to Transport emissions from HELCOM Parties in 2021. Unit: kg(N)/km²/year.

Table 7. List of all sources considered in this study, sorted (from largest to smallest) by their contribution to total airborne deposition of oxidized nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. 'Ox-N': contribution to oxidized nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea in 2021 given in tonnes(N), 'Perc.': percentage of total. Example: The Transport sector in Finland contributed 1170 tonnes(N) to oxidized nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea, which was the $24th$ largest single contribution among the sources considered in this study and corresponds to 1.2% of the total deposition of airborne oxidized nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. The sum of all percentages listed in this table equals 100% and corresponds to the calculated total annual value of 100.6 ktonnes(N). BAS and NOS contributions from other sectors than transport are not listed here as they are exactly zero.

Table 8. Top 25 contributions to oxidized nitrogen deposition in 2021, listed for each of the nine sub-basins of the Baltic Sea separately. Unit: tonnes(N)/year. The numbers in the bottom row give the percentage of these 25 contributions to the total deposition of oxidized nitrogen in the respective sub-basin. The table continues on the next two pages.

Table 8. cont'd.

Table 8. cont'd.

3.2 Reduced nitrogen deposition

Table 9 lists contributions to reduced nitrogen deposition in the entire Baltic Sea by country/region and by sector. The single largest contribution comes from Agriculture in DE, i.e. ammonia emissions from the agricultural sector in Germany. Its contribution amounts to about 20 ktonnes(N) of reduced nitrogen deposition in the year 2021. Also when summing up all sectors, Germany makes the largest contribution (about 23% of the total deposition of reduced nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2017), followed by Poland, EUnonHel, and Denmark.

The percentage contributions by countries/regions listed in the second-to-last column of Table 9 and the percentage contributions by sector (last row of Table 9) are visualized as pie charts in Figure 10.

The percentage contribution made by each sector to a county's/region's total contribution is shown in Figure 11. As the Agriculture sector (blue bars) stands for by far the largest emission of reduced nitrogen in all countries/regions, it is not surprising that it also makes by far the largest contribution among the 5 selected sectors for every country/region (92.4%).

As seen in Table 9, there are some small negative contributions as well. Amounting typically to a few tens of tonnes(N)/year, these are negligible compared to the total deposition of reduced nitrogen to the Baltic Sea (90 505 tonnes/year). They are due to chemical interactions between reduced and oxidized nitrogen. E.g. the Power sector emits almost exclusively oxidized nitrogen, but this oxidized nitrogen can lead to more particle formation and thus to longer transport distances of reduced nitrogen (particles are less easily deposited than gases). Therefore, small reductions can occur due to emissions from Power in some countries, as seen in Table 9 and Figure 11. Similar statements can be made for the OSC sector. The degree to which this effect is reduced or overwhelmed by co-emitted reduced nitrogen depends on the country, its energy mix, the chemical regime and the geographic distance from the Baltic Sea. However, common to all cases is that this effect is very small.

Table 9. Contributions from different countries/regions and sectors to reduced nitrogen deposition in the entire Baltic Sea. Unit: tonnes(N)/year. Source countries/regions are sorted vertically by their percentage contribution to reduced nitrogen deposition ("contribution by country to total", from largest to smallest). For comparison, the results from the last report (for 2017) are given in grey font in the last column.

Figure 10. Contributions from different countries/regions (left pie) and from sectors (right pie) to deposition of reduced nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. The pie charts are based on the percentages given in bold type in Table 9.

Figure 11. Percentage contribution made by each sector to the country's/region's total contribution to reduced nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea in 2021. For each country/region, the 5 bars sum up to approximately 100%, corresponding to the country's/region's total contribution.

Figures 12 and 13 show the horizontal distribution of reduced nitrogen deposition contributed by the Agriculture sector in different countries/regions in 2021. The Agriculture sector is chosen here as an example as it has the largest impact on reduced nitrogen deposition among the five sectors considered in this study. In general, the source country/region affects itself the most (in terms of deposition per unit area), but long-range transport does occur, with somewhat longer transport distances to the east than to the west. Nevertheless, the effects are more confined to the source countries/regions than in the case of oxidized nitrogen (compare with Figures 8 and 9), which is related to the shorter lifetime of reduced nitrogen in the atmosphere. The effect from NOS and BAS are zero, as no ammonia is emitted from international shipping.

Table 10 contains the same information as Table 9, but sorts all the contributions from sources considered in this study from largest to smallest. As mentioned above, Agriculture from DE tops this list, but there are many other Agriculture contributions among the top 10. The top 10 contributions make up 91.5% of the total, while the top 25 contributions account for about 99% of the total.

Finally, Table 11 lists the top 25 contributions among the considered sources for each of the 9 subbasins of the Baltic Sea. Agriculture emissions are strongly represented in this table, and of course the geographic location of countries/regions with respect to the sub-basin in question plays a role also in this case.

Figure 12. Contribution to reduced nitrogen deposition from Agriculture emissions from the EUnonHel group of countries (left) and the 'RoEMEP' group of countries/regions in 2021. Unit: kg(N)/km²/year.

Figure 13. Contribution to reduced nitrogen deposition from Agriculture emissions from HELCOM parties in 2021. Unit: kg(N)/km²/year.

Table 10. List of all sources considered in this study, sorted (from largest to smallest) by their contribution to total airborne deposition of reduced nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. 'Re-N': contribution to reduced nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea in 2021 given in tonnes(N), 'Perc.': percentage of total positive. Example: The Agricultural sector in Latvia contributed 940 tonnes(N) to reduced nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea, which was the 10th largest single contribution among the sources considered in this study and corresponds to 1.0% of the total deposition of airborne reduced nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. The sum of all percentages listed in this table equals 100% and corresponds to the calculated total annual value of 90.5 ktonnes(N).

Table 11. Top 25 contributions to reduced nitrogen deposition in 2021, listed for each of the nine sub-basins of the Baltic Sea separately. Unit: tonnes(N)/year. The numbers in the bottom row give the percentage of these 25 contributions to the total deposition of reduced nitrogen in the respective sub-basin. The table continues on the next two pages.

Table 11. Cont'd.

Table 11. Cont'd.

3.3 Total nitrogen deposition

Total nitrogen is calculated as the sum of oxidized and reduced nitrogen.

Table 12 lists contributions to total nitrogen deposition in the entire Baltic Sea by country/region and by sector. The single largest contribution comes from Agriculture in DE, amounting to about 22 ktonnes(N) of total nitrogen deposition in the year 2021. Also when summing up all sectors, Germany makes the largest contribution (corresponding to about 19% of the total deposition of total nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021), followed by EUnonHel (13.6%), Poland (12.7%), and 'RoEMEP' (11.2%).

The Agriculture sector makes by the largest contribution to total nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea (47.7%), followed by the Transport sector (33.7%). Together they thus stand for more than four fifths of the nitrogen input from the atmosphere to the Baltic Sea.

The percentage contributions by countries/regions listed in the second-to-last column of Table 12 and the percentage contributions by sector (last row of Table 12) are visualized as pie charts in Figure 14.

The percentage contribution made by each sector to a county's/region's total contribution is shown in Figure 15. Agriculture dominates for all countries, followed by the Transport sector.

Table 12 also lists the results for total country contributions that were calculated in the previous project for 2017 conditions (Gauss et al., 2020). In this context it is interesting to note that the actual total nitrogen deposition was much smaller in 2021 than in 2017 (191 vs 228 kt(N)). This is due to a combination of changes in emissions and the model version, as well as the effect of meteorology. Figure 16 shows actual and normalized total nitrogen deposition for the last ten years, as calculated in 2023. The actual value for 2017 is 225 kt(N), i.e. 3 kt(N) less than listed in Table 12. This is due to the updates of the EMEP model since Gauss et al. (2020). Further, the normalized depositions decreased by about 28 kt(N) from 2017 to 2021. Normalized depositions, as calculated by EMEP MSC-W, largely follow emission change (as they filter out meteorological variability). Finally, the maximum and minimum values indicate depositions that would occur if meteorological conditions were most favorable/unfavorable to deposition. The fact that the actual and normalized values for 2017 almost coincide indicates that 2017 was rather normal, while for 2021, meteorological conditions lead to lower-than-normal deposition, the difference amounting to about 6 kt(N). Thus, the overall difference between actual values reported for 2017 (Gauss et al.. 2020) and for 2021 in this report are mainly due to emission change (explaining about 76% of it) followed by meteorological conditions (16%), and model updates (8%). However, how much of the change in emissions (e.g. 3677 kt(N) in 2017 from the nine HELCOM countries vs. 3467 kt(N) in 2021) is due to Covid-19 and how much reflects a long-term trend in emissions remains difficult to estimate based on the data available to us.

Table 13 contains the same information as Table 12, but sorts all the contributions from sources considered in this study from largest to smallest. As mentioned above, Agriculture from DE tops this list, but there are many other Agriculture contributions among the top 10. Transport stands out as the second most important contributor to total nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea, with BAS Transport emissions actually coming in second place in Table 13. The top 10 contributions in this table make up 61.4% of the total, while the top 25 contributions account for nearly 90% of the total.

Finally, Table 14 contains the top 25 contributions by sub-basin for total nitrogen deposition in 2021. The top 10 spots for each sub-basin are almost exclusively populated by contributions from Transport and Agriculture, but also in this case, the contributions from other sectors are not negligible.

Table 12. Contributions from different countries/regions and sectors to total nitrogen deposition in the entire Baltic Sea. Unit: tonnes(N)/year. Source countries/regions are sorted vertically by their percentage contribution to total nitrogen deposition ("contribution by country to total", from largest to smallest). For comparison, the results from the last report (for 2017) are given in grey font in the last column.

Figure 14. Contributions from different countries/regions (left pie) and sectors (right pie) to the deposition of total nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. The pie charts are based on the percentages given in bold type in Table 12.

Percentage of total contribution (tot-N)

Figure 15. Percentage contribution made by each sector to the country's/region's total contribution to total nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea in 2021. For each country/region, the 5 bars sum up to 100%, corresponding to the country's/region's total contribution.

Figure 16. Actual and normalised depositions of total nitrogen, calculated in 2023 for the most recent 10-year period for which data are available. Minimum and maximum values are also shown, depicting what would be the deposition in the most favorable/unfavorable meteorological condition encountered since 1990. The actual value for 2021 corresponds to the value listed in Table 12 (the actual value plotted here for 2017 deviates slightly from the value listed in Table 12 as those calculations were done in 2019 with a different model version and input data).

Table 13. List of all sources considered in this study, sorted (from largest to smallest) by their contribution to total airborne deposition of total nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. 'Tot-N': contribution to total nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea in 2021 given in tonnes(N), 'Perc.': percentage of total. Example: The Transport sector in Sweden contributed 2921 tonnes(N) to total nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea, which was the 18th largest single contribution among the sources considered in this study and corresponds to 1.5% of the total deposition of airborne total nitrogen in the Baltic Sea in 2021. The sum of all percentages listed in this table equals 100% and corresponds to the calculated total annual value of 191.1 ktonnes(N).

Table 14. Top 25 contributions to total nitrogen deposition in 2021, listed for each of the nine sub-basins of the Baltic Sea separately. Unit: tonnes(N)/year. The numbers in the bottom row give the percentage of these 25 contributions to the total deposition of reduced nitrogen in the respective sub-basin. The table continues on the next two pages.

Table 14. Cont'd.

Table 14. Cont'd.

4. Conclusions

A sector-wise source-receptor calculation has been performed with the EMEP MSC-W model on EMEP's $0.3^\circ \times 0.2^\circ$ grid regular lon-lat grid for the year 2021. We have calculated the contributions from 13 source countries/regions and 5 selected emission sectors (i.e. 65 country/sector combinations) to depositions of oxidized, reduced and total nitrogen in the Baltic Sea and its 9 subbasins. Calculations with emissions and meteorological data of the year 2021.

The main conclusions from the study can be formulated as follows:

- The largest contributions to oxidized nitrogen deposition come from the **Transport** sector;
- The Transport sector accounts for about **62%** of oxidized nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea;
- The largest contributions to reduced nitrogen deposition come from the **Agriculture** sector;
- The Agriculture sector accounts for about **92%** of reduced nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea;
- For total nitrogen deposition, both the Agriculture and Transport sectors make large contributions, accounting for 48% and 34% to total nitrogen deposition, respectively;
- While in 2017, the agricultural sector contributed 107 kt(N), corresponding to 47% of the total nitrogen deposition in 2017 (according to results from the previous project of this kind). In 2021, it contributed 91 kt(N), corresponding to 48% of the total nitrogen deposition in 2021.Thus, although the absolute contribution of the agricultural sector has decreased, its share has increased slightly, because the other sectors have reduced their contributions more;
- The single most important contribution to total nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea is made by the Agriculture sector in Germany (accounting for 11.3%), followed by Transport in BAS (i.e. Baltic sea international shipping) accounting for 9.4%, Agriculture in Poland (7.7%), the EUnonHel group of countries (7.1%), and Denmark (6.4%);
- NOx emissions from international shipping in the Baltic Sea and North Sea together cause about 13% of total nitrogen deposition in the Baltic Sea;
- The other three sectors considered in this study (Power generation, Other Stationary Combustion, and all other sectors) account for much less deposition: about one tenth of the total from each of the three sectors, for both oxidized and reduced nitrogen;
- An Excel file containing all source-receptor results is made available along with this report, and files with gridded data (on netCDF format) have been stored and can be made available on request.

5. References

- Bartnicki, J., A. Gusev, W. Aas, M. Gauss, J. E. Jonson, 2017: Atmospheric Supply of Nitrogen, Cadmium, Mercury, Lead, and PCDD/Fs to the Baltic Sea in 2015, EMEP MSC-W Technical report 2/2017, available online at http://emep.int/publ/helcom/2017/
- Bartnicki, J and A. Benedictow, 2017: Contributions of emissions from different countries and sectors to atmospheric nitrogen input to the Baltic Sea basin and its sub-basins Meteorological Synthesizing Centre-West (MSC-W), Oslo, Norway, January 2017, ISSN 0332-9879. Available online at https://emep.int/publ/reports/2017/MSCW_technical_3_2017.pdf
- CEIP, 2019: Annexes to the 2014 Guidelines for Estimating and Reporting Emission Data, information on ISO Country codes, Notification form to the UNECE secretariat and Extended guidance, [https://www.ceip.at/ms/ceip_home1/ceip_home/reporting_instructions/annexes_to_guidel](https://www.ceip.at/ms/ceip_home1/ceip_home/reporting_instructions/annexes_to_guidelines) [ines,](https://www.ceip.at/ms/ceip_home1/ceip_home/reporting_instructions/annexes_to_guidelines) last accessed 15 May 2020.
- Denier van der Gon, H., M. Gauss and C. Granier (eds.), 2023: Documentation of CAMS emission inventory products, deliverable report for the Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service, DOI: 10.24380/q2si-ti6i
- EEA (European Environment Agency), Emissions of air pollutants from transport in Europe, published 18 Dec 2023, URL: [https://www.eea.europa.eu/en/analysis/indicators/emissions-of-air](https://www.eea.europa.eu/en/analysis/indicators/emissions-of-air-pollutants-from)[pollutants-from,](https://www.eea.europa.eu/en/analysis/indicators/emissions-of-air-pollutants-from) accessed on 17 April 2024.
- EMEP Status Report 1/2023 (2023). "Transboundary particulate matter, photo-oxidants, acidifying and eutrophying components" Joint MSC-W & CCC & CEIP Report. Available online at http://emep.int/publ/reports/2023/EMEP_Status_Report_1_2023.pdf
- Gauss, M., Aas, W, Nyiri, A., and Klein, H., 2023: Nitrogen Emissions and atmospheric nitrogen deposition to the Baltic Sea. HELCOM Baltic Sea Environment Fact Sheets and EMEP MSC-W report for HELCOM. Available online at <https://emep.int/publ/helcom/2023/index.html>
- Gauss, M., A. Nyiri and H. Klein, 2020: Contribution of emissions from different countries and sectors to atmospheric nitrogen input to the Baltic Sea and its Sub-basins, EMEP MSC-W Report for HELCOM, MSC-W Technical Report 2/2020, available online at https://emep.int/publ/reports/2020/MSCW_technical_2_2020.pdf
- Jalkanen, J.-P., A. Brink, J. Kalli, H. Pettersson, J. Kukkonen and T. Stipa, 2009: "A modelling system for the exhaust emissions of marine traffic and its application in the Baltic Sea area", Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics 9 (2009) 9209-9223.
- Jalkanen, J.-P., L. Johansson, and J. Kukkonen, 2016: A comprehensive inventory of ship traffic exhaust emissions in the European sea areas in 2011, Atmos. Phys. Chem., 16, 71–84, 2016 [https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-71-2016.](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-71-2016)
- Johansson, L., J.-P. Jalkanen, and J. Kukkonen, 2017: Global assessment of shipping emissions in 2015 on a high spatial and temporal resolution, Atm. Env., 167, 403-415, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.08.042
- Simpson, D., Benedictow, A., Berge, H., Bergström, R., Emberson, L. D., Fagerli, H., Flechard, C. R., Hayman, G. D., Gauss, M., Jonson, J. E., Jenkin, M. E., Nyíri, A., Richter, C., Semeena, V. S., Tsyro, S., Tuovinen, J.-P., Valdebenito, Á., and Wind, P.: The EMEP MSC-W chemical transport model – technical description, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 7825-7865, doi:10.5194/acp-12-7825- 2012, 2012.
- Simpson, D., Gauss, M., Mu, Q., Tsyro, S., Valdebenito, A., and Wind, P.: Updates to the EMEP MSC-W model, 2020-2021, in: Transboundary particulate matter, photo-oxidants, acidifying and eutrophying components. EMEP Status Report 1/2021, The Norwegian Meteorological Institute, Oslo, Norway, 2021.
- Simpson, D., Gonzalez Fernandez, I., Segers, A., Tsyro, S., Valdebenito, A., and Wind, P.: Updates to the EMEP/MSC-W model, 2021–2022, in: Transboundary particulate matter, photo-oxidants, acidifying and eutrophying components. EMEP Status Report 1/2022, pp. 133–146, The Norwegian Meteorological Institute, Oslo, Norway, available from www.emep.int, 2022.
- Simpson, D, van Caspel, W., Benedictow, A., Fagerli, H., Jonson, J.-E., Tsyro, S., Valdebenito A., and Wind, P.: Updates to the EMEP/MSC-W model, 2022–2023, in: Transboundary particulate matter, photo-oxidants, acidifying and eutrophying components. EMEP Status Report 1/2023, pp. 159–180, The Norwegian Meteorological Institute, Oslo, Norway, available from www.emep.int, 2023.